



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,479	08/02/2000	Tzyy-Shuh Chang	63937-104	8192

26127 7590 09/04/2003

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
39577 WOODWARD AVENUE
SUITE 300
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5086

EXAMINER

BARTH, VINCENT P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2877

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/630,479

Applicant(s)

CHANG, TZYY-SHUH

Examiner

Vincent P. Barth

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary Comments

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 13 June 2003, **PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED**. New grounds of rejection and/or discussions of Claims 6 and 8 are set forth below. Claim 6 had been the subject of a final rejection based on so-called "common knowledge" in the art, which was not traversed by Applicant during prosecution, rather, Applicant traversed the rejection of these claims for the first time in the Appeal Brief dated 13 June 2003. A further discussion of this matter will follow in the section below entitled Comments.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

2. If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 15-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Milnes, U.S. Patent No. 3,187,185 (1 Jun., 1965).

5. Referring to Claim 1, Milnes discloses a device for: (i) determining the surface contours of an object, such as high-temperature metals in metal foundries, wherein the object or metal is at such temperatures that it will have a self emitted EMR, described therein in one exemplary embodiment as "red-hot steel" (col. 1, ln. 69). Milnes further discloses: (ii) an EMR source, in the form of a light (col. 1, ln. 53), and (iii) a EMR detector or sensor in the form of a camera (col. 1, ln. 57). Milnes further discloses: (iv) that the system may project a different wavelength EMR upon the object than the object's self-emitted wavelength (col. 1, lns. 65-69). The example provided therein, is one exemplary embodiment in which the sample is glowing red-hot (i.e. self-emitting in the red spectrum of visible light), and wherein a blue or ultra-violet beam may be incident upon it, such that the self-emitting EMR is distinguishable. Claim 1 contains the elements of Milnes discussed in the paragraph above, in particular elements (i)-(iv), and Applicant has added the additional limitation that the incident light source has a wavelength which is selected as a function of the temperature and material composition of the object. Claim

Art Unit: 2877

1 calls for a device producing an image from an object with a temperature dependent, dominant, self-emitting EMR, which corresponds to (i) above, the imaging of the “red-hot steel” or other high-temperature objects. In this context, in one exemplary embodiment the “dominant” self-emitting radiation in Milnes is red, and such is clearly temperature dependant, since the metal will emit differently at different temperatures in other embodiments (i.e. different temperature configurations). Applicant has argued that the example of the color red provided in Milnes suggests that human eyesight is involved, and therefore that the colors perceived by humans is relevant. The Examiner disagrees, since Milnes clearly discloses a machine assisted vision apparatus and method (i.e., using cameras for sensing and analysis), in which human color perception is not relevant. It is the opinion of the Examiner that in the context of the disclosure in Milnes, which describes a machine assisted vision system, the term “color” is indeed intended to indicate wavelength, and would be understood as such by those practicing the invention. A discussion of this point is treated separately below in a section entitled Supplemental Comments Concerning Applicant’s Remarks That Color Equals Wavelength. Moreover, the strict construction of the term “red hot” in Milnes by Applicant to mean only precisely red, as opposed to other spectral ranges is too narrow, and not supported by the reference. Applicants have also argued that the emission spectrum of the hot body in Milnes is never discussed as a function of temperature. However, the emission spectra of hot objects, both in and outside of the visible range have been well known for a considerable time, and thus would have been understood by those practicing the invention disclosed in Milnes. The fact that emission spectra of hot objects have been known also has a bearing on the new proposed limitation that the incident light source is selected as a function of temperature and material composition of the object. Since Milnes is

Art Unit: 2877

clear that the incident light must have a color which is contrasted with the object's self emitted radiation, and since such emission spectra have been known, those skilled in the art would understand that such results in a functional dependence on the emitted radiation. Applicant further argues that the invention in Milnes can not function, since Milnes suggests that the surface of the conveyor contrast with the beam (citing Milnes at col. 1, Ins. 70-71). However, it is the opinion of the Examiner that any contrast with the conveyor surface is merely an ancillary feature of the disclosure in Milnes, and is thus not dispositive. The critical feature in Milnes is that "the color of *the beam* of light 6 is selected so that it *contrasts with the color of the workpiece P*" (col. 1, Ins. 66-68, emphasis added). Please also note the discussion regarding the conveyor in the section below entitled Comments.

6. Referring to Claim 2, Milnes discloses a system of television cameras, however, it does not explicitly include video recorders attached to said cameras. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add such an element. It was commonly known that a video camera may be attached to a television camera to record events. See, MPEP §2144.03, and In re Malcolm, 129 F.2d 529, 54 U.S.P.Q. 235 (1942).

7. Referring to Claim 3, Milnes discloses a system of television cameras, however, it does not explicitly include a CCD as a substitute for said cameras. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make such a substitution from the prior art in Milnes. It was commonly known in the art that a CCD may be substituted for a television camera. See, MPEP §2144.03.

8. Referring to Claim 4, the claim seeks to add a further limitation in that the light beam incident on the surfaces should be at least one light from a group consisting of metal-halite

lamps, fluorescent lamps, and xenon lamps. Milnes has, as one preferred embodiment, a generically describe light source, although additional light sources are permitted as well. The Specification does not disclose the reason for limiting the types of light to metal-halite lamps, fluorescent lamps, and xenon lamps, when other art recognized equivalents may be suitable for the same purpose, and as such is a non-critical limitation. Moreover, the last paragraph at page 8 of the instant Application it is stated that other types of light sources may be used, as long as the desired wavelengths may be generated. Accordingly, the limitation of the group of lights to only metal-halite lamps, fluorescent lamps, and xenon lamps does not patentably distinguish over the prior art of Milnes.

9. Referring to Claim 5, Milnes discloses a system in which the light source is described generically. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make a substitution with a laser from the prior art in Milnes. It is commonly known in the art that a laser may be used as a light source, and this would be a choice suggested by Milnes in the context its disclosure. Milnes discloses a system wherein the dominant frequency of the self-emitting radiation from the object is to be distinguishable from the source light incident on said object. Thus, a narrow band of incident light, either filtered from a broad-spectrum source, or a narrow band source would be used, whereby the latter design choice could be met by a laser. Therefore, such substitution would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

10. Referring to Claim 6, Milnes does not explicitly use the term "zone of illumination" in its disclosure. However, Milnes discloses a system in which contours of the object as well as thickness are measured (see Figs. 8-10). Towards this end, multiple lines of light, and other

configurations of light are created from the beams incident upon the object (col. 2, lns. 3-13). This includes a measuring beam, and a reference beam (col. 2, lns. 12-13). The description of these beams found in Milnes is consistent with the description at page 9 in the instant Application. Applicant has noted that a laser can be a “point illumination source”, but has defined the structured illumination in the instant Specification at page 9 as being comprised of “single lines to multiple lines” and the like. Milnes explicitly illustrates such structured illumination in Figures 8-10, as it is defined by Applicant. Moreover, outside of the field of mathematics in which a “line” has no width (i.e. is truly one-dimensional), all so-called “lines” or “lines of light” in the field of optics have both a width and a length. Thus the “lines of light” disclosed in Milnes are zones of illumination, since each has both width and length. Accordingly, the proposed limitation in Claim 8 is not patentably distinguishable over the prior art in Milnes.

11. Referring to Claim 7, Milnes discloses a system of light sources, however, it does not explicitly include mirrors to direct them. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add such an element. It is commonly known in the field of optics that mirrors may be used to direct light sources. See, MPEP §2144.03, and In re Malcolm, 129 F.2d 529, 54 U.S.P.Q. 235 (1942).

12. Referring to Claim 8, Milnes discloses a system in which contours of the object as well as thickness are measured (see Figs. 8-10). Towards this end, multiple lines of light, and other configurations of light are created from the beams incident upon the object (col. 2, lns. 3-13). This includes a measuring beam, and a reference beam (col. 2, lns. 12-13). The description of these beams found in Milnes is consistent with the description at page 9 in the instant Application. Applicant has noted that a laser can be a “point illumination source”, but has

defined the structured illumination in the instant Specification at page 9 as being comprised of "single lines to multiple lines" and the like. Milnes explicitly illustrates such structured illumination in Figures 8-10, as it is defined by Applicant. Accordingly, the proposed limitation in Claim 8 is not patentably distinguishable over the prior art in Milnes.

13. Referring to Claim 9, Milnes discloses a system in which a high-temperature object may be imaged with video cameras, and in which a wavelength different from the self-emitted wavelength may be directed at the object to be distinguishable therefrom. Thus, the ability to image the object is inherent in the system, since a variety of wavelengths may be required based on the range of self-emitting wavelengths, versus the range of source wavelengths which must differ therefrom. Accordingly, the proposed limitation in Claim 9 is not patentably distinguishable over the prior art in Milnes.

14. Referring to Claim 10, Milnes discloses a system in which a high-temperature object may be imaged with video cameras, and in which a wavelength different from the self-emitted wavelength may be directed at the object to be distinguishable therefrom. Moreover, by virtue of the high temperature of the object as exemplified in Milnes, that is, glowing "red-hot" (col. 1, ln. 69), it will necessarily emit in a variety of wavelengths, including the range of 175 to 1000 nm (i.e., mid UV to near IR). Thus, the CCD must have the ability to image the objects in a variety of wavelengths, based on the range of self-emitting wavelengths, versus the range of source wavelengths which must differ therefrom. Accordingly, the proposed limitation in Claim 10 is not patentably distinguishable over the prior art in Milnes.

15. Referring to Claim 15, Milnes discloses a system of light sources, however, it does not explicitly include mirrors to direct them. However, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add such an element. It is commonly known in the field of optics, that modulation of the incident beam, and demodulation of the reflected beam received may be used to distinguish background radiation, or in this case self-emitted radiation, from the source light incident upon the object. See, MPEP §2144.03, and In re Malcolm, 129 F.2d 529, 54 U.S.P.Q. 235 (1942).

16. Referring to Claim 16, the Specification does not draw an appropriate distinction between the pulsing of the light source, as in the instant claim, and modulation of the light source, as in Claim 16. Nevertheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add such an element. It is commonly known in the field of optics, that modulation of the incident beam, and demodulation of the reflected beam received may be used to distinguish background radiation, or in this case self-emitted radiation, from the source light incident upon the object. Therefore, since the modulation and the pulsing of the source beam are functionally equivalent, the same principle applies.

17. Referring to Claims 17 and 18, Milnes provides a system in which both the surface contours, and the thickness of the object can be measured, therefore a variety of configurations are within the scope of its disclosure. In particular, see Figure 7 of Milnes, in which a plurality of EMR sources in the form of lights, as well as sensor in the form of cameras or television cameras are contained therein.

18. Referring to Claim 20, Milnes discloses a light source 4, wherein in one exemplary embodiment the light is in the form of a plane of light (col. 2, ln. 6). However, the image analysis scheme does not appear to hinge on such structured illumination, therefore alternative embodiments in which a larger area were to be illuminated would have been obvious to those

skilled in the art at the time of the invention. Moreover, the strict construction of the term "area" to preclude a line of light as is disclosed in Milnes is not supported in the reference.

17. Claims 11-13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)) as being unpatentable over Milnes, U.S. Patent No. 3,187,185 (1 Jun., 1965), in view of King, U.S. Patent No. 5,995,008 (30 Nov., 1999).

18. Referring to Claims 11 and 12, Milnes discloses a filter which may be interposed between the workpiece and the sensing device, such that the visibility is enhanced (col. 1, ln. 71 to col. 2, ln. 2). This disclosure of a filter is generic in form, and should be read in the context of that same paragraph in which the workpiece is at high temperatures, and thereby emitting a characteristic EMR. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add a filter, including an interference filter. Moreover, it is commonly known in the field of optics that filters may be used to reduce the effects of undesired EMR frequencies before such are incident upon a sensor, so as to achieve meaningful and more accurate results for later analysis. For example, King discloses that interference filters have been used in imaging and spectral analysis in the context of flame and fire detectors (col. 2, ln. 49). Milnes and King are analogous art, since they are from a similar problem solving area, in that each involves viewing high temperature subjects. See Medtronic, Inc. v. Cardiac Pacemakers, 721 F.2d 1563, 1572-1573, 220 USPQ 97, 103-104 (Fed. Cir., 1983). The motivation for combining the references would have been to improve the imaging of high temperature subjects. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to combine the references, at the time of the invention, in order to gain such benefit.

19. Referring to Claim 13, King also discloses the use of a cut-off filter in imaging and spectral analysis in the context of flame and fire detectors (col. 4, lns. 40-43).

20. Referring to Claim 19, one exemplary “dominant” self-emitting radiation in Milnes is red, and such is clearly temperature dependant, since the metal will emit differently at different temperatures. Milnes discloses a television camera, which corresponds to the video camera in Claim 19, and a light source 4 (see Fig. 1). Claim 19 also calls for an interference filter. Milnes discloses a filter which may be interposed between the workpiece and the sensing device, such that the visibility is enhanced (col. 1, ln. 71 to col. 2, ln. 2). This disclosure of a filter is generic in form, and should be read in the context of that same paragraph in which the workpiece is at high temperatures, and thereby emitting a characteristic EMR. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add an interference filter. The reason for such, is that it is commonly known in the field of optics, that filters may be used to reduce the effects of undesired EMR frequencies before such are incident upon a sensor, so as to achieve meaningful and more accurate results for later analysis. King discloses that interference filters have been used in imaging and spectral analysis in the context of flame and fire detectors (col. 2, ln. 49).

21. Claims 14, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)) as being unpatentable over Milnes, U.S. Patent No. 3,187,185 (1 Jun., 1965), in view of Fishman, U.S. Patent No. 4,744,407 (17 May, 1988).

22. Claim 14 contains all of the limitations in Claim 1, but seeks to add a further limitation in that an air flow controller provides air to the object to remove air density distortion. As

Art Unit: 2877

discussed above, Milnes discloses, *inter alia*, a system in which an object, such as high-temperature metal in a metal foundry, is at such temperatures that it will have a self emitted EMR, described therein as “red-hot steel” (col. 1, ln. 69). Moreover, as is in the nature of such high-temperature environments in metal foundries and the like, the heat emitted from the object causes disturbances in the air, and thus optical distortions resulting therefrom. The Specifications at p. 11 of the Application states that such air flow controller “decreases the temperature gradient around the hot object”, indicating that cool air at a sufficient pressure to meet the desired flow rate would be introduced. Fishman involves a system in which molten metals must be observed in a foundry, and wherein “chilled air” is introduced to prevent “interference” with the vision of the camera (col. 4, lns. 61-66). Although the language of Fishman does not explicitly state that the “chilled air” reduces optical distortion, it is clear from the context of a camera imaging molten metals, that the temperature of the air serves this purpose, and the term “interference” as used in Fishman is intended to mean “optical distortion” as used in the instant claim. Moreover, the chilled air or other inert gas are introduced at a “positive pressure”, again indicating from the context that a flow of air at an appropriate rate passing the hot object is maintained (col. 4, ln. 64). Therefore, Fishman suggests that when imaging an object at sufficiently high temperatures that optical distortion occurs, one would introduce chilled air passing the object at an appropriate flow rate to control such effects. Milnes and Fishman are analogous art, since they are from a similar problem solving area, in that each involves viewing high temperature subjects. See Medtronic, Inc. v. Cardiac Pacemakers, 721 F.2d 1563, 1572-1573, 220 USPQ 97, 103-104 (Fed. Cir., 1983). The motivation for combining the references would have been to improve the imaging of high temperature subjects.

Art Unit: 2877

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to combine the references, at the time of the invention, in order to gain such benefit.

23. Referring to Claim 21, Milnes discloses an EMR source in the form of a light 4 (see Fig. 1), a detector in the form of a camera 11, and as discussed above at length, a system in which the incident light contrasts with self-emitted radiation of the hot object. Milnes does not disclose that an airflow controller is introduced to reduce the temperature gradient and thereby remove optical distortion. Fishman involves a system in which molten metals must be observed in a foundry, and wherein “chilled air” is introduced to prevent “interference” with the vision of the camera (col. 4, lns. 61-66). Although the language of Fishman does not explicitly state that the “chilled air” reduces optical distortion, it is clear from the context of a camera imaging molten metals, that the temperature of the air serves this purpose, and the term “interference” as used in Fishman is intended to mean “optical distortion” as used in the instant claim. Milnes and Fishman are analogous art, since they are from a similar problem solving area, in that each involves viewing high temperature subjects. The motivation for combining the references would have been to improve the imaging of high temperature subjects. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to combine the references, at the time of the invention, in order to gain such benefit.

24. Referring to Claim 22, the combination of Milnes and Fishman would not explicitly address the issue of adjusting the cooling airflow such that the temperature distribution of the object were not adversely affected. However, “[I]t is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See MPEP §2144.05(II). In the context of the instant invention, knowing

that ambient temperatures might affect the final metal product, those practicing the invention would clearly experiment with the temperature of the cooling airflow until arriving at a suitable temperature mix not affecting said final metal product.

Comments

23. The Examiner objects to the traversal of Claims 6 and 8 in Applicant's Appeal Brief dated 13 June 2003. Claim 6 had been the subject of a final rejection based on so-called "common knowledge" in the art, which was not traversed by Applicant during prosecution, rather, Applicant traversed the rejection of these claims for the first time in the Appeal Brief dated 13 June 2003. The Claim 5 rejection was changed, although not traversed in the Appeal Brief, merely because of its close technical connection to the limitation in Claim 6. Claim 8 did not contain such a rejection, although Applicant characterized it as such in the Appeal Brief. The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the predecessor to the current Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, had long held that Applicants must traverse any rejections prior to appeal which are based on limitations which are well known, common knowledge, or standard procedures in the art. See In re Soli, 137 USPQ 797 (CCPA 1963), In re Chevenard, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943), In re Gunther (CCPA 1942). See also the current revision to the MPEP §2144.03(C) (8th Ed., Rev. 1, Feb. 2003) which states that Applicant must traverse any fact considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art, otherwise such facts are to be taken as admissions of prior art. However, said section of the MPEP continues by advising that the Examiner *should* indicate clearly in the next Office Action that failure to traverse will be taken as an admission of

prior art. Such notice was not provided in the Office Action dated 5 February 2003.

Accordingly, the instant statement shall presently provide such notice that any further failure to traverse will be taken as an admission of prior art. Therefore, although such notification by the Examiner is optional, as a courtesy to Applicant prosecution has been re-opened, *inter alia*, to notify Applicant of this provision in the revised MPEP. This, although publication of said revision, as well as the earlier publication of the above cited court decisions, places all parties on constructive notice of the relevant provisions. The above discussion shall not be construed as a statement or representation as to whether, in light of the above cited court decisions, traversal following an RCE would have been a more appropriate remedy to preserve any rights, as opposed to traversal for the first time in an appeal brief.

24. Although currently moot based on the Examiner having re-opened prosecution, in the event that a brief is filed at a later date, the following notice concerning Applicant's Appeal Brief is provided. Applicant's Appeal Brief dated 13 June 2003 includes a statement that Claims 1-22 do not stand or fall together (Appeal Brief, page 2, section VII entitled Grouping of Claims), but fails to present reasons in support thereof as required by 37 CFR §1.192(c)(7). See MPEP §1206, in particular, pages 1200-10 to 1200-11, discussing 37 CFR §1.192(c)(7), and citing Ex parte Schier, 21 USPQ 1016 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1991) and Ex parte Ohsumi, 21 USPQ2d 1020 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1991). It is important to note that Rule 192(c)(5) as cited in Schier and Ohsumi is now 37 CFR §1.192(c)(7). Schier and Ohsumi were decided on the same day in 1991, therefore both opinions essentially mirror each other with respect to the discussion regarding what is now 37 CFR §1.192(c)(7), "*and ... appellant presents reasons as to why appellant considers the rejected claims to be separately patentable*" (emphasis original), Ohsumi at 1022.

Schier and Ohsumi were decided on the same day in 1991, and the Board at that time ruled that, "Because of the relative newness of the rule, however, we will in this instance construe the record as a whole as being in compliance ... Following this decision, we feel that there should be no instance in which a brief having either form of the above-noted inconsistency reaches us unchallenged by the examiner under 37 CFR §1.192(d)" (emphasis added), Schier at 1019. Accordingly, the Applicant's Brief, if re-filed, must be amended to set forth in detail precisely *why* appellant considers the rejected claims to be separately patentable.

25. The following prior art reference is of interest: Burk, U.S. Pat. No. 5,162,873 (10 Nov. 1992), which discloses a system for inspecting the surface contours of high-temperature metal slab with self-emitting radiation (col. 5, ln. 10), and in which one or more lasers 22 (Fig. 2) are used. Burk uses a filter to avoid optical problems from at least infrared radiation generated by the hot slab (col. 5, lns. 8-12).

**SUPPLEMENT COMMENTS
CONCERNING APPLICANT'S REMARKS
ASSERTING THAT "COLOR DOES NOT EQUAL WAVELENGTH"**

*Photons from the Object Impinge on the Detector in Milnes,
not a Human Eye*

26. Applicant's arguments in the Appeal Brief contain a discussion from pages 9 through 11 entitled "Color does not equal Wavelength". This line of argument is not on-point because the system disclosed in Milnes has the photons (i.e. light) reflecting from the hot object, as well as photons self-emitting from the hot object, impinging on a detector (i.e. a television camera 11 in Fig. 1), rather than a human eye. Therefore, Applicant's line of argument which relates to colors as perceived by the human eye is not relevant. Moreover, human perception of photos (i.e. light) emanating from the hot object in Milnes is not contemplated because Milnes also discusses the detection of ultra-violet light reflected from the object (col. 1, ln. 69), *which is not visible to humans*. It is in this respect that the Milnes reference teaches a machine assisted vision system.

The Term "Color" in the Milnes Reference Means Wavelength

27. The Milnes reference also shows a filter 13 disposed between the workpiece P and the camera 11. Said filter is explicitly referred to in the Milnes reference as follows:

"A filter 13 of appropriate *color* is interposed between workpiece P and camera 11 to enhance the visibility of the image beam." (col. 1, ln. 71 to col. 2, ln. 2, emphasis added).

Thus, Milnes indicates that the filter serves to prevent the passage of light of a particular "color" on its way to the camera. For this reason, the Milnes reference intended the term "color" to mean color *as it would be detected by the camera 11, rather than by a human*. Accordingly, the term "color" in the Milnes reference is intended to mean wavelength to those practicing the invention.

Art Unit: 2877

CONCLUSION

25. Applicant's Claims 1-22 are rejected based on the reasons set forth above.
26. Any inquiries concerning this communication from the Examiner should be directed to Vincent P. Barth, whose telephone number is 703-605-0750, and who may be ordinarily reached from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. The fax number for the group before final actions is 703-872-9318.
27. If attempts to reach the Examiner prove unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor is Frank G. Font, who may be reached at 703-308-4881.
28. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.



Richard A. Rosenberger
Primary Examiner